DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 168 EA 010 992

AUTHOR Coleman, Peter
TITLE School Boards as Policy-Makers.
PUB DATE Sep 78
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Metropolitan Fraser Valley Seminar of the British Columbia School Trustees Association (September 22-24, 1978); Appendix may not reproduce clearly

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Board of Education Policy; Board of Education Role; Decision Making; Decision Making Skills; Elementary Secondary Education; *Policy Formation; Political Power

ABSTRACT

Decision-making in general and policy decisions in particular are the prime responsibility of school boards because policies are control mechanisms by which trustees assert local control. Policy decisions differ from others in their concern with values and purposes and the legitimization of the organization to society at large. Additionally, they tend to be broad in scope and relatively permanent attempts to guide or regulate lower level decision-making. Rational models of decision-making in which policy-makers seek optimal alternatives amongst a wide range of choices are limited in application by practical issues such as time shortages. Conflict or political models are difficult to implement because finding the "optimal alternative" requires negotiating some consensus amongst pressure groups. One consequence of conflict models is to reduce significantly the role of expertise. In policy-making, boards need systematic ways of (1) identifying policy issues requiring attention, (2) prioritizing policy concerns, (3) arriving at decisions, (4) stating board policies, and (5) evaluating the effectiveness of policies. Boards with such skills and techniques are generally very effective at making policy decisions, and they provide excellent leadership in education. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED161168

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCHOOL BOARDS AS POLICY-MAKERS

Peter Coleman
Superintendent
St. Boniface School Division
Manitoba

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Peter Coleman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A Paper Presented at the
Annual Metropolitan Fraser Valley Seminar
of the
British Columbia School Trustees Association
September 22 - 24, 1978

EA 010 992

SCHOOL BOARDS AS POLICY-MAKERS

A B S T R A C T

Decision-making in general, and policy decisions in particular, are the prime responsibility of school boards, because policies are control mechanisms by which trustees assert local control.

Policy decisions differ from others in their concern with values and purposes, and the legitimation of the organization to society at large. Additionally, they tend to be broad in scope and relatively permanent attempts to guide or regulate lower level decision-making.

Rational models of decision-making, in which policy-makers seek optimal alternatives amongst a wide range of choices, are limited in application by practical issues such as time-shortages, and also by conflict or political models, in which "optimal alternative" acquires the sense of negotiating some consensus amongst pressure groups. One consequence of conflict models is to reduce significantly the role of expertise.

In policy-making, boards need systematic ways of (1) identifying policy issues requiring attention, (2) priorizing policy concerns, (3) arriving at decisions, (4) stating board policies, and (5) evaluating the effectiveness of policies. Boards with such skills and techniques are generally very effective, by the criterion established here, and they provide excellent leadership in education.

In approaching a topic of this kind, one generally commences with some definitions. However, I propose to assume for the moment a general understanding of what policies are, and deal with some other issues first. In the body of the paper, some definitions will be developed, together with a set of specifications for a good policy, which I hope will be helpful subsequently.

A. VALUE ASSUMPTIONS: The Importance of Policy Development

A policy workshop is particularly appropriate and important for school trustees. The fundamental responsibility of the school trustees to the people who elect them I have stated elsewhere thus:

> "The trustee has been entrusted with ensuring that the wishes of the community are part of the complex of forces that produce the compromise decisions that commonly occur on a wide range of issues in public education, as in other areas of public life." (Coleman, 1974, p.53)

In general, trustees carry out their responsibilities by the development and implementation of policies. A policy is a way of asserting control over certain functions or activities of an organization, by specifying purpose or direction, and/or by requiring certain activities. A policy is a control mechanism. Many school boards miss this significance, and hence do not in their actions pay enough attention to policy-making as an important responsibility. Given the nature of lay control, and the fact that trustees have power solely as members of a corporate body, the policy statement is virtually the only form of legitimate legal control the trustees have over their organizations. They can require their administrators and teachers to comply with their policies, but not with their wishes expressed in other ways.

Two value assumptions follow from this. The first concerns activities of boards. A school board may do many things: it may deliberate at great length, publicly or privately, and debate a wide range of issues, from many points of view. It may hear delegations, receive briefs, gather information from a wide variety of sources,

including its own administration. All of these activities are desirable and necessary, but in the final analysis, what counts is the quantity and the quality of the decisions made by the school board. My primary assumption is that a school board is, above all, a decision-making body.

Since the particular responsibility of boards is for policy decisions rather than administrative decisions, the second assumption, which will be developed later, is that highly effective boards concentrate on policy decisions. There is some evidence that in the past, many school boards, like other forms of democratic government, have not been very effective in producing high quality policy decisions, in the requisite quantity. They spend much of their time on other concerns of an administrative nature, and hence the policy decisions which are properly the concern of the board tend to be made, if at all, by other people in the system. In one study, only 16 of 187 board decisions were policy decisions; the majority of the balance were really administrative decisions (Campbell, 1970, p.189).

These assumptions suggest a need for some self-evaluation by school boards. After all, school boards frequently and properly insist on the evaluation of their administrators, their teachers, their bus drivers, and their students. Boards are of course evaluated by the voters of the school district, but this evaluation occurs after a considerable interval, and when negative, results in the replacement of individual board members. This may or may not have the effect of creating a more effective school board. Policy development certainly supplies a criterion by which boards could undertake self-evaluation.

B. THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS: 1. School Board Decision-Making

In bureaucratic organizations, decision-making is of major importance. Responsibility for decision-making is allocated on a hierarchical basis, with the policy-making body bearing ultimate responsibility for all decisions at all levels. If this line of authority or hierarchical system is examined more closely, it can be analysed into three separable spheres of activity or functions. Parsons suggests that these should be labelled the Technical System, the Managerial System, and the Institutional System (1958, p.41). The Technical function is primary in the sense that it is invariably present, even in the simplest system. In education, the technical function is that of teaching. The managerial function becomes necessary when the division of labour in the technical function becomes sophisticated and particularly when the goals of the organization are not easily identified. Managers establish rules of operation, because progress toward the goal is hard to measure. "Whenever there is no clear linkage between the nature of an action and its value or ultimate end, pressure arises for the development of formal rules to help individuals decide their behaviour" (Downs, 1967, p.59). This is the essential nature of a bureaucracy.

The third sphere is the community or institutional function. The main task here is legitimation, ensuring that the goals, purposes and activities of the organization are understood and valued by the community served. The corrollary is organizational responsiveness to community needs.

Each of the functions carries decision-making responsibilities. The different skills and knowledges to carry out the functions and to make decisions require the delegation of decision-making power. In effect, the institutional level decides on a particular policy and its implementation. The managerial and technical levels decide on a wide variety of minor decisions relevant to how the policy is to be implemented. As Downs points out,

> "the result is that the policies of any organization are defined at all levels, and not just at the top. At every level there is a certain discretionary gap between the orders the official receives from above and those he issues downward, and every official is forced to exercise discretion in interpreting his superior's orders" (1967, p.134).

It is imperative that this characteristic of institutional level or policy level decision-making be recognized by those responsible. It is usually unnecessary for a policy statement to spell out in detail precisely how the policy should be implemented. It is necessary for it to carry a clear indication of the goal to be accomplished, and the way in which goal accomplishment will be measured , to ensure that in the process of implementation the policy does not get distorted.

The process of decision-making is generally considered to consist of a number of readily definable stages. "The task of decision involves three steps: a listing of all the alternative

strategies; the determination of all the consequences that follow upon each of these strategies; and the comparative evaluation of these sets of consequences" (Simon, 1965, p.67; see also Katz and Kahn, 1966, p.274).

The most recent emphasis is on later stages added to those already described. Dror (1968) suggests the importance of feedback after decision-making. This is so important that at least one critic of bureaucracy has suggested that it constitutes a defining characteristic. "A bureaucracy is a system of organization in which the feedback process, error-information-correction does not function"(Crozier, 1964 p.186). Most theorists of decision-making assume that the process outlined does not in fact occur. For example, Lindblom points out that

> "This way of looking at policy-making is useful for some purposes, but it tends to view policy-making as though it were the produce of one governing mind, which is clearly not the case. It fails to evoke or suggest the distinctively political aspects of policy-making, its apparent disorder, and the consequent strikingly different ways in which policies emerge" (Lindblom, 1968 p.4).

Another major reason why decision-making in practice is not as tidy as in theory is probably the limitations on the time of the decision-makers. They may begin by searching for possible alternative courses of action and information concerning their consequences. However, they will probably select the first alternative encountered which meets some minimum standard of satisfaction. The substitution of "satisficing" for "maximizing" greatly reduces the demand upon the decision-maker. Thus, the decision-maker chooses an adequate alternative rather than continuing to search for the best possible alternative. (See Lindblom, 1968, p.24 and Taylor, 1965, p.62).

B. THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS: 2. School Board Policy-Making

Policy-making is a special case of decision-making, which requires differentiation between policy decisions and other kinds of decisions. For school boards, this is a critical distinction.

Policies are generally high on each of the following dimensions: generality or abstractness, scope of reference, permanence, and values. These dimensions distinguish between various kinds of decisions made in organizations. Generally policy-making concerns itself with substantive goals and objectives, and the procedures and devices for achieving these and evaluating goal achievement. (Katz and Kahn, 1966, p.26; p.259). Most succinctly,"policy is the value content of the administrative process" (Shipman, 1969, p.122).

Policy-making may be regarded as the particular function of the institutional level of management. As such, it is always concerned with legitimation, that is, with gaining recognition from society at large of the validity and social utility of the organization. The concern with purposes, then, asserts the place of a particular organization in a wide range or organizations all serving particular goals and purposes. It follows that policy statements almost always refer to human values, and assert the importance of a particular value, at least by inference. Thus, a school board policy banning smoking in high schools asserts the value of health and fitness, as against other values, such as self-determination by young adults. Such a policy asserts a custodial function for educational organizations. This is undoubtedly important to citizens, and thus the policy helps to legitimate the organization.

The critical determiner of whether an issue is in fact a policy issue or an administrative issue tends to be the connection the issue has with overall goals and purposes. Educational organizations generally can be characterized as having educational goals, that is, things which the leaders of the organization hope will be attained by and for students. Frequently these are not adequately articulated (see March, 1974, on "organizational anarchy"). However all organizations have general organizational purposes. Gross characterizes these purposes as follows:

(1) satisfying human interests, of both members and non-members,
(2) producing services or goods with
(3) an efficient use of scarce inputs, by
(4) investing in their own viability,
(5) mobilizing the resources needed as inputs, and doing all these things
(6) in conformance with certain codes of behaviour, and
(7) in a rational manner (1964, p.480).

This can readily be restated as a set of purposes for educational organizations (see Appendix A).

The vast majority of policy statements and policy decisions made by a school board should refer directly to educational goals or organizational purposes and/or to general rules intended to serve these goals or purposes and exercise control by the policy-makers over the activities of the organization.

It becomes, then, relatively straightforward to decide whether a particular decision is a policy decision or an administrative decision. The area of reference of the decision, the intrinsic

nature or characteristics of the decision, and the relation of the decision to ganizational purposes are the main clues. If the decision refers primarily to the institutional sphere, that is, to the community at large and relationships between the school district and that larger community, then it is almost certainly not an administrative decision. If the intrinsic nature of the decision is general or abstract, broad in scope, permanent, and involves values, it is likely to be a policy decision. "Administrative decisions are typically decisions about matters of fact made in the light of existing purposes" (Walton, 1969, p.60).

Let us now turn our attention to the process of policy development. An idealized process of policy development at the school board level is analyzable into five stages: initiation, in which a problem requiring a policy solution is identified; definition, in which relevant and irrelevant elements are distinguished; deliberation, in which compromises and adjustments of opinion take place as data is presented; enactment, in which proposal is stated in the form of a motion, and approved by vote; and consequences, in which the effects are assessed. This sometimes leads back to the beginning of the process. (Based on Campbell,1970, p.192).

Based on this analysis, and the material developed in the previous section, the following procedure is recommended for school boards involved in policy-making.

Step 1. IDENTIFY THE ISSUE.

The issue requiring decision may appear on the agenda, or it may arise out of discussion of an agenda item. Clearly, it must be perceived as an issue requiring a decision by some member of the board or the administrative staff.

Step 2. DISTINGUISH POLICY ISSUES, OR POLICY ELEMENTS OF ISSUES.

The following questions should be asked:

Area of Reference

A. Does the decision or issue relate primarily to the community, or representatives of it?

Characteristics

B. Is the issue general in nature?and/or broad in scope? (i.e. referring to all teachers, all schools).

C. Will the decision guide future decisions referred to in later discussions? (Campbell, 1970)

D. Does the issue have long-term implications? (e.g. the design of a building)

E. Does the issue primarily involve values, as opposed to facts?

Relevance to Purposes

F. Does the issue clearly bear directly on purpose?

Restrictions on Disposition

G. Does the Public Schools Act, or other pertinent legislation require that this issue be dealt with by board policy?

If the answer to any of the above questions is "yes", and no relevant policy exists, then the issue requires a policy decision.

Step 3. ACCUMULATE RELEVANT INFORMATION.

The normal procedure would be to ask the staff to prepare a report. Alternatively, in a question involving purposes, or other community interests, a poll could be conducted, or representations sought from interested groups.

Step 4. FORMULATE ALTERNATIVES.

This step and the previous one are very closely related; the formulation of alternatives may reveal the need for additional information. In any event, every effort should be made to open as many alternatives as possible. This is particularly important in dealing with controversial issues in which a wide range of interest groups has strong opinions.

Step 5. FORECAST CONSEQUENCES OF EACH ALTERNATIVE.

Clearly, some consequences are unpredictable. Others are just as certainly predictable. For instance, the decision to hire highly qualified but inexperienced teachers is going to involve increased expenditures annually over a number of years, to pay for increments.

Step 6. SELECT THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE, AND STATE IT IN POLICY FORM.

A variety of decision techniques exist to allow rational choice between alternatives (see, e.g. Mann, 1975).

Step 7. PASS A MOTION TO APPROVE AND PUBLICIZE THE POLICY STATEMENT.

STEP 8. PROVIDE FOR FEED-BACK ON THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE DECISION.

This is an imperative but often overlooked step. The failure to provide for some evaluation of the policy frequently results in the arrival of delegations protesting the policy, and a crisis atmosphere.

This rational model of policy development is too simple, of course. Elsewhere I have argued that in recent years, power has become widely distributed in educational systems, and neither boards nor administrators now have reliable influence on events.

Decisions in education are very frequently questioned, not because they are wrong, but because some interested groups were not consulted. At the present time, "satisficing" in policy-making generally consists of displeasing the fewest individuals or interest groups possible.

The consequences of these trends to more pluralistic structures and administrative powerlessness are substantial. In general, they enforce a different kind of decision-making. A rational decision-making model in which a series of alternatives is examined in relation to overall goals by a wise and far-sighted administrator, or a group of decision-makers working in isolation from political pressures, is now only relevant to a small range of unimportant decisions. On most serious issues, there are at least two alternative points of view based on different value positions, and requiring different courses of action. Making decisions usually requires coping with conflict (Coleman, 1976).

This view of decision-making provides six generalizations about major decisions in education:

1. They are characterized by compromise and consensus based on the representation of different points of view by different interest groups, perceived as having the right of consultation.
2. The decision-making process is routinized in the representative committee which is so common a feature of the lives of administrators now as to be virtually invisible.

3. Each representative is expected to provide some value positions as a contribution to the decision-making process. This contribution legitimizes the decision made, in the eyes of organizational members and clients.

4. The decision made will usually be a compromise between different preferences, rather than some "best" decision in the technical sense. However, this view incorporates the rational-technical model generally used by decision theorists, since different interest groups provide different alternatives, and often the "best" (in some sense) alternative will be chosen.

5. This view then significantly limits the importance of technical competence, and thus of professional control of decision-making.

6. Decision-making is likely to be carried on in a climate of hostility and conflict, as groups pursue or protect what they consider important values (Coleman, 1976).

One current view is that the reconciliation of rational and political models is the major problem for policy-makers at present: issues such as accountability and community control "can be interpreted as a struggle to reintegrate political and administrative factors in education policy" (Mann, 1975, p.10). Put another way, "educational leadership in Canada is today facing a difficult dilemma: whether and how to attempt to reconcile the competing demands for the exercise of intelligence and the free play of politics in the policy-making process" (Downey, 1977). This is part of a very much larger issue facing all governments everywhere: how to make proper use of experts, and particularly the scientists

who effectively control weapons of absolute destruction (see C.P. Snow's Science and Government, 1961, for a chilling account of this problem). In educational policy-making this involves the development of a new role for senior administrators, the policy researcher role (see Coleman, 1974, and Ingram and Miklos, 1977, p.32).

But the need for reconciliation between professionals and politicians may have been exaggerated in recent studies of educational governance such as that of Ziegler and Jennings (1974). In fact, administrators are necessarily politically responsive: "The administrative process is one of our political processes . . . out of which comes a consensus that approximates the public interest" (Mainzer, 1973, p.72). This consensus may rest on a congruence of values, in which case what seems like co-optation is only the co-operation of like-minded people (Boyd, 1975). After all, boards choose superintendents, not the reverse. Hence, board policies, "the operational statements of values" (Kogan, 1975, p.55) generally do at present represent some political and compromise between technical considerations.

C. EVALUATING THE POLICY-MAKING FUNCTION:

1. Issues and Policies

It has already been suggested that the effectiveness of a school board can be assessed by an examination of its policy output. But these policies must focus on important issues. Many school boards do not have policies on issues of major importance, probably because they lack the data necessary to identify the issues. This data should emerge from routine reports prepared for the board of trustees, but "there are very few people who grasp the importance of routine reporting and even fewer who understand

how to set up appropriate reporting procedures" (Caplow, 1976, p.51).

In general, the board should receive routine reports on all the major issues previously described as organizational purposes (see Appendix A). These might include reports on student achievement in basic skills, on teacher evaluation procedures and their implementation, on staff hirings, transfers and releases, on administrator performance, on program development, on the ongoing financial situation of the district, and on community opinion about the schools and the school district.

Other major sources of policy issues are trustees themselves, particularly newly-elected trustees who tend to have programs or interests which become agenda items, and the concerns of clients or constituents expressed in communications to the board.

Such issues often challenge existing goals and purposes, whether these have been stated explicitly or not. Hence an examination of the kinds of decisions made by a school board in the course of a year will almost invariably reveal some rather marked failures of consistency between decisions and goals and purposes. It is often difficult to identify the real goals of educational organizations. March describes educational organizations as "organized anarchies" in part for this reason (1974, p.24).

This characteristic creates unique difficulties for the educational administrator: "When he wanders into the domain of coalition decision-making or goal-free problem solving, the administrator is little aided by our current ideas about problem solving" March, 1974, p.25). March challenges both rational and

conflict models of decision-making: "Managers who make decisions might well view that function somewhat less as a process of deduction or a process of political negotiation, and somewhat more as an opportunity for upsetting preconceptions of what the organization is doing" (p.35). This form of decision-making can be characterized as "decision-making as goal discovery". It is not an original insight in organizational theory (see, e.g. Etzioni, 1964).

C. EVALUATING THE POLICY-MAKING FUNCTION:

2. Content of Policy Statements

The appropriate content of the full policy statement follows from what has already been said. A policy should include the following:

1. A careful statement of purposes and values to be served.
2. An indication of persons affected by the policy, either as implementors or as subjects.
3. A detailed description of the circumstances or context in which the policy applies.
4. Specific actions required by the policy (if necessary).
5. A statement of the rationale for the particular policy chosen.
6. A justification of the particular policy chosen.
7. A set of indicators of effectiveness for the policy.

The first four of these will be not be discussed. (See Appendix B for an illustration of a policy statement.) However, the others are worth commenting on, as they are not commonly included in policy statements. (See Kerr, 1976, for a very full and detailed discussion of the reasons for including these elements.)

The rationale for the policy should be given in some detail in order to allow implementors and others interested in and affected by the policy to understand the reasons for adopting the policy. This should contribute to compliance with the policy, and provide a record for the policy-makers in subsequent reviews of the policy. This record is frequently not available: "Most often, when one goes looking for the policies of educational institutions, one finds no more than a statement of who is to do what under what conditions . . . Frequently there is not even a record of the point of the policy" (Kerr, 1976, p.213). Policy review sessions frequently run into difficulties because people do not recall why a particular policy was adopted.

The justification for a policy is a somewhat different notion. It has already been suggested that "policy is the value content of the administrative process" and thus the value-based justification for a policy is its most critical element. This concern with values is not emphasized in the rational model or the political model, in which "the appropriate role of the policy-maker is that of a politician who is adroit in the conduct of 'partisan mutual adjustment' until such time as the level of consensus that is sufficient for action is reached" (Kerr, 1976, p.128). Kerr claims that appropriate justifications for policies are based on tests of desirability, effectiveness, justness, and tolerability. Very briefly summarized, desirability suggests that the policy must promote beliefs, attitudes, skills or values that are appropriate for some definition of the good life. Effectiveness requires that the policy must be more likely than any other identified alternative to achieve in some measure

the purpose of the policy. Justness requires that the policy must, both in purposes and the means adopted, be in accord with prevailing notions of natural justice, and with any codes, regulations, or laws intended to protect the rights of individuals.

An illustration may be helpful in understanding this point. In the last decade, a variety of proposals have been made to authorities in Canada and the United States to provide for equalizing the financial resources made available by senior levels of government to school districts. This policy shift is advocated on the grounds of justness or equity, specifically a concern with equality of educational opportunity. (See Coleman, 1972; 1978 for more discussion of this illustration.) Kerr asserts the overriding value of justness in educational policy-making: "If no just means can be identified for achieving specified goals, then no policy may be better than any policy at all" (1976, p.155). The fourth test, toleratibility, requires that costs be proportionate to the purposes, lower than the costs of alternative policies, and that undesirable side-effects must not be intolerably high.

C. EVALUATING THE POLICY-MAKING FUNCTION:

3. Provisions for Policy Evaluation

An evaluation system for board policies has two functions. Clearly, if a school board spends a good deal of time developing a policy statement which has an important purpose, required actions, and a well-developed rationale and justification, one important aspect is continuing assessment of the effectiveness of the policy. The identification and modification of ineffective policies should be a systematic annual process.

This review system must allow a reassessment of policy objectives: "Experience should be used explicitly as an occasion for evaluating our values as well as our actions" (March, 1974, p.36). It may be that attempts to assess the effectiveness of policies will illustrate that the purposes were either not precisely stated, or have changed since they were stated, so that the policy may be more or less effective in the light of different purposes asserted in the review process.

Consider a simple example: A school board has as an objective the provision of an effective elementary school science program. In the policy statement, the indicator of effectiveness is "a level of knowledge of basic scientific processes equal to or greater than the provincial norm". A provincial assessment reveals that the district's elementary students have knowledge at the provincial norm, which is disastrously low by comparison with other jurisdictions. This result will test both the board's values and their actions: was it the intention of the board to provide an effective science program in the sense that it was as good as neighbouring programs, or was the intention the provision of a high standard of education. Educators will recognize this as a fundamental value dilemma, posed by Bloom's "Mastery Learning" theories, which suggest that "school learning is a highly alterable characteristic - if appropriate learning conditions are made available to the students" (Bloom, 1976: p.65).

In addition, the review system should allow for objective measurement of the success of a given policy. If the policy statement is a comprehensive one, containing indicators of how success would be measured, then the task of providing data would

not be difficult. (An illustration of how even rather complex governmental policies can be evaluated is given in Coleman, 1978. More general discussion appears in Mann, 1975, pp.129-139.)

D. EVALUATING SCHOOL BOARDS AS POLICY-MAKERS

What has been dealt with in the previous sections suggests at least one way in which the effectiveness of a school board can be assessed. An effective school board will have:

a) Systematic processes for making decisions on complex and important policy issues, approximating rational decision-making models;

b) Systematic and regular ways of identifying policy issues, including the review of routine reports on the attainment of goals and purposes in the district;

c) Techniques for priorizing the issues which arise, and a routine way for getting important issues on the board agenda;

d) A standard format for policy statements which makes the intent and purposes of policies clear, as well as the intended actions, the rationale, the justification, and the ways in which effectiveness of the policy is to be assessed; and

e) Provision for a regular review of outcomes, in which the indicators given in the policy statement guide the collection of data on the policy outcomes.

A board which has a careful strategy for making policy decisions, good techniques for identifying appropriate issues for consideration, a well-designed set of policy statements, and a good review procedure is, by this definition, an excellent school board.

By and large, this assessment can be made by means of objectively verifiable information, and in my opinion, constitutes a reasonable and relatively inexpensive self-evaluation process for school boards.

But note that the measurement of policy outcomes is not the appropriate way to measure the effectiveness of policy-makers. Rather, "policy-makers should be preoccupied with making justifiable policy decisions" (Kerr, 1976, p.212). This is because sound policies can have disappointing outcomes, unanticipated even by wise, careful and far-sighted policy-makers.

Given the assumptions stated in the opening section regarding the importance of policy-making as a function of school boards, the issue is critical, and as in other areas of public policy-making, the stake is large: it is a continuation of the present democratic methods of governance in education. Alternatives proposed seem either less effective, or less democratic (Coleman, 1974). Time is short, since public pressures for better and more responsive policy-making are vigorous and impatient. The response of trustees to this challenge will probably decide, in the next few years, whether trustees will become increasingly functionless or become quite clearly the educational leaders of our society.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Bloom, Benjamin S. Human Characteristics and School Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.

Boyd, W.L. "School Board-Administrative Staff Relationships." In Cistone, P.J. (ed.) Understanding School Boards. Lexington, Massachusetts" D.C. Heath, 1975.

Campbell, Roald F. et al. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1970.

Caplow, Theodore. How to Run Any Organization. Hinsdale, Illinois: The Dryden Press, 1976.

Coleman, Peter. Policy-Making at the School Board Level. Winnipeg: The Manitoba Association of School Trustees, 1972.

Coleman, Peter. "The School Trustee and Educational Leadership." Interchange, Vol.5, No.2, pp.53-62, 1974.

Coleman, Peter. "The Increased Pluralism and Politicization of Public Education - Coping with Conflict." Report on the Conference for District Superintendents: The Increased Pluralism and Politicization of Public Education. Victoria: Faculty of Education University of Victoria, 1976.

Coleman, Peter. "Provincial Finance Policies in Manitoba, 1971-76: A Case Study." In Educational Research and Policy Formation. Toronto: The Canadian Education Association, 1978.

Crozier, M. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Downey, Lorne W. "Politics and Expertise in Educational Policy-Making." Education Canada, pp.22-26, Fall 1977.

Downs, Anthony. Inside Bureaucracy. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967.

Dror, Yehezkel. Public Policymaking Re-examined. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1968.

Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1964.

Gross, Bertram M. The Managing of Organizations: The Administrative Struggle. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Ingram, Ernest and Miklos, Erwin. Guidelines for Employment of School Superintendents. Edmonton: The University of Alberta, 1977.

Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Kerr, Donna. Educational Policy: Analysis, Structure and Justification. New York: David McKay Co., 1976.

Kogan, M. Educational Policy-Making: A Study of Interest Groups and Parliament. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1975.

Lindblom, Charles E. The Policy-Making Process. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

Mainzer, Lewis C. Political Bureaucracy. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1973.

Mann, Dale. Policy Decision-Making in Education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1975.

March, James G. "Analytical Skills and the University Training of Educational Administrators." The Journal of Educational Administration, pp. 17-44, May, 1974.

Parsons, Talcott. "Some Ingredients of a General Theory of Formal Organization." In Halpin, Andrew W. Administrative Theory in Education. New York: The MacMillan Company, pp.40-72, 1958.

Shipman, George A. "Role of the Administrator - Policy Making as Part of the Administrative Process." In Lyden, Fremont J. et al (eds.) Policies, Decisions, and Organization. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behaviour. Second Edition. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Snow, C.P. Science and Government. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Taylor, D.W. "Decision-Making and Problem-Solving." In March, James G. (ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, pp.48-86, 1965.

Walton, John. Administration and Policy-Making in Education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.

Ziegler, L.H. and Jennings, M.K. Governing American Schools: Political Interaction in Local School Districts. Belmont, Calif: Duxbury Press, 1974.

APPENDIX A

A MATRIX OF PURPOSES FOR A SCHOOL DIVISION

ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSES (hierarchically ranked)			
A. Satisfaction of Human Interests (OUTPUT)	GOALS	INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS 1. Development skills in reading, writing, speaking and listening; 2. Learn how to examine and use information; 3. Gain a general education; and 4. Develop a desire for learning now and in the future.	PERSONAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS 5. Develop pride in work and a feeling of self-worth; 6. Develop good character and self-respect and 7. Learn to respect and get along with people with whom we work and live.
B. Production of Services (OUTPUT)	PROGRAMS	1. Provision of satisfactory programs which assist growth in cognitive and affective areas specified in program objectives and meet needs. 2. Development, implementation, evaluation, and review of programs capable of achieving educational goals.	
	INSTRUCTION	1. Provision of instruction which maximizes student growth in cognitive and affective areas. 2. Development of teachers' instructional capabilities and effectiveness.	
	ADMINISTRATION	1. Provision of administrative services which assist in defining goals and purposes, and in achieving them once defined.	
C. Efficiency of Resource use (INPUT)	PUPIL TIME	Optimum distribution of pupil time to maximize development. Requires assessment of strengths and weakness to guide placement. In upper grades, can be provided via options.	
	TEACHER TIME	1. Optimum utilization of professional time, with maximum allocated to professional functions, minimum allocated to non-professional functions. 2. Optimum match between teacher characteristics and student placement, with regard to students, subject area, and school.	
	USE OF FACILITIES	Optimum utilization of school facilities, day and evening.	

	USE OF FUNDS	Optimum utilization of school budget.
D. Investment in Viability (INPUT)	PUPIL PARTICIPATION	Optimum levels of pupil participation in every aspect of school life.
	TEACHER COMMITMENT	Optimum levels of commitment by teachers to meeting pupil needs, performing assigned tasks, and voluntary contributions to achieving school goals.
	ADMINISTRATOR COMMITMENT	Optimum levels of administrator commitment to the educational goals and organizational purposes of the division.
E. Mobilization of Resources (INPUT)	OPERATING RESOURCES	Optimum levels of financial and professional support.
	COMMUNITY SUPPORT	Optimum levels of community involvement in and approval of school activities.
F. Observance of Codes (PROCESS)	LEGAL REQUIREMENTS	Organization functions in accordance with statutes and regulations.
	DIVISION POLICY AND REGULATIONS	Organization functions in accordance with Divisional policies and regulations.
	UNWRITTEN CODES	Organization functions in accordance with unwritten codes such as standards of professional practice, "due process", "natural justice", and others.
G. Rationality (PROCESS)	ADEQUATE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES	Satisfactory system of decision-making Satisfactory internal communication system.
	TECHNICAL ELEMENTS	Satisfactory records kept and utilized. Simple and thoroughly understood operating procedures.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Adopted by the Board of School Trustees of the St. Boniface School Division, June 12, 1978.

STUDENT SMOKING IN SCHOOL BUILDINGS

Purpose: This policy has the purpose of eliminating smoking by students in school buildings, in the hope that this will reduce student smoking in the interests of fitness, and also of fire prevention.

Persons Affected: The policy applies to all students in St. Boniface. All professional staff are expected to assist in implementing this policy.

Application: The policy applies generally to all school buildings at all times, including evening use.

Actions Required: Professional staff who observe students smoking in a school building must immediately report the occurrence to the building administrator, with appropriate details of time, place, and students involved.

Rationale: Alternative policies were proposed by the administration including the provision of smoking lounges. However, in view of strong community feeling on the issue (approximately 85% of parents favour the present policy), and the unpleasant conditions which could be created for non-smokers if smoking were permitted, the present policy was unanimously approved.

Justification: The justification of the present policy is based on (1) the health of students, including the non-smokers who would inevitably be affected by smoking in schools, (2) the potential for fires (e.g. in student lounges) which would threaten the safety of all occupants of a building, and (3) the present social concern for physical fitness, in the light of rising health costs to the society at large. It is acknowledged that the effectiveness of the policy in limiting smoking amongst students is questionable, but so are the limits of the educational system's influence on the decisions made by young adults.

Indicators of Effectiveness: The policy will be considered to be effective if (1) it is generally accepted (by a count of cases reported - 100 breaches per year is considered unacceptable) and (2) the percentage of students reporting themselves as non-smokers is maintained or increased, annually.